

Project ID 2748-01-01
WIS 164 Reconstruction
(I-94 to WIS 175)
Waukesha and Washington Counties

Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting No. 3

Date: June 28, 2000

Location: Public Library, Village of Sussex

Attendees:

Brian Bliesner, WisDOT Waukesha District Office, Project Manager
Brad Heimlich, CH2M HILL, Consultant Project Manager
Jeff Bauer, CH2M HILL
Dan Dupies, CH2M HILL
Theresa Kubista, CH2M HILL
Mary O'Brien, Transportation Environmental Management (subconsultant to CH2M HILL)
Roger Cupps, WisDOT Waukesha District Office
Linda Hoehne, WisDOT Waukesha District Office
Jay Waldschmidt, WisDOT Central Office, Bureau of Environment, Madison
Jeff Retzlaff, Planning & Zoning Administrator, Town of Richfield
Jeff Klug, Local Business owner
David White, Director of Public Works, Village of Pewaukee
Jeff Weigel, Director of Public Works, City of Pewaukee
Ken Yunker, SEWRPC
Ken Pesch, Washington County Highway Commissioner
Don Weiland, citizen interest
Ann Remmel, citizen interest
Jeff Gonyo, citizen interest
Chuck Kugel, citizen interest
Steve Holzhauer, Town of Richfield Planning Commission
Jerry Schmitz, Chairman, Town of Lisbon
Steve Bruskiwicz, Director of Public Works, Village of Germantown
Joe Greco, Village of Menomonee Falls
Kevin Yanny, Waukesha County Transportation Department
Becky Plotecher, Town of Lisbon
Jeff Musche, Town of Lisbon
Curt Bolton, Village of Sussex

AGENDA AND DISCUSSION

1. Re-introduction of PAC Members, Affiliations

Brad Heimlich opened the meeting and welcomed PAC members and visitors. Study team and PAC members introduced themselves. Brad briefly reviewed the meeting agenda, and asked that visitors hold their questions and comments until after the meeting to allow ample time for PAC members to participate in discussions. He noted that discussions would focus on the study team's recommendations regarding alternatives that should be retained for detailed evaluation in the Draft EIS and those that should be dropped from further evaluation. Brad noted that there would also be discussion on Draft EIS Section 1—Purpose and Need, if time permits. Section 1 was distributed to PAC members by mail prior to the meeting.

2. Review Purpose, Goals, and Objectives of PAC

Brad reviewed the PAC rules of engagement. It is important that members listen to each other, engage in positive discussion and debate, and openly share opinions and concerns. Although consensus may not be reached regarding the best course of action for the WIS 164 corridor, the spirit of the PAC effort will be to achieve a solution that most members can support.

3. Review PAC #2 Outcome; PAC #3 Handout and Objectives

Brad summarized PAC #2. Most discussion at that meeting concerned the Power Corridor alternative, 2-lane improvements, and SEWRPC's traffic modeling results for representative off-alignment alternatives. Key items that have resulted from PAC input to date include the following:

- ❑ An “urban threshold” volume of 13,000 vehicles per day (versus a “rural threshold” of 7,000) is being used to determine time frames for future capacity expansion in the WIS 164 corridor.
- ❑ 2020 traffic diversion modeling for three scenarios on existing WIS 164 was done by SEWRPC: WIS 164 as a 4-lane road with present posted speeds, WIS 164 as a 2-lane road with present speeds, and WIS 164 as a 2-lane road with speed reduced to 45 mph. Two additional scenarios were modeled assuming the Power Corridor alternative would be in place: WIS 164 as a 2-lane road with a 45 mph posted speed, and WIS 164 as a 4-lane road with existing present posted speeds.
- ❑ Traffic diversion modeling was also done for a representative off-alignment alternative that would tie Capitol Drive to WIS 16 up to Lindsay Road, and for the power corridor alternative both of which would bypass the southernmost part of the study corridor.
- ❑ An urban or “hybrid” rural/urban cross section will be used rather than a completely rural cross section that would require 200-300 feet of right-of-way.

Brad referenced and summarized the materials in the PAC handout packet that included the

following: Meeting agenda, list of PAC members, information sheet on structure/role of PAC, project contacts, impact summary table for various alternatives, study area maps with project sections designated, regional planning context summary, map showing existing and forecast traffic, roadway typical section sheet, and project schedule.

4. General Project Update

Mary briefly reviewed some key points regarding the Draft EIS:

- ❑ The Draft EIS is the decision document for projects like the WIS 164 Corridor Study; it brings together community, public, and agency interests and recommends a future course of action.
- ❑ The Draft EIS is prepared in accordance with the National and Wisconsin Environmental Policy Acts and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regulations since FHWA is the lead agency for the Draft EIS.
- ❑ Draft EIS sections include Purpose and Need for Proposed Action, Alternatives, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Comments/Coordination.
- ❑ Purpose and Need is the most important section because it sets the stage for the range of reasonable alternatives and ultimately, selection of a recommended alternative.

Mary briefly reviewed key items in the Purpose and Need section for the WIS 164 study:

- ❑ The main focus is regional transportation and land use planning in accordance with the adopted *2020 Regional Transportation System Plan* prepared by SEWRPC in consultation with local municipalities.
- ❑ Specific Purpose and Need topics with respect to the WIS 164 corridor include system linkage and route Importance, existing and future traffic volumes, existing highway deficiencies, safety, and corridor preservation.
- ❑ The discussion on local versus through traffic split is not yet complete pending results of WisDOT's traffic study.

Brad provided a brief update on other study activities:

- ❑ The Draft EIS Purpose and Need section is posted on the project's web site; other sections are in progress.
- ❑ Wetland inventories are nearing completion.
- ❑ Initial archaeological investigations have been completed; additional work (non-intrusive radar penetration) will be done to determine the potential for Native American burials or effigy mounds near Lindsay Road and 164 and near the Greystone subdivision at Pleasant Hill. More testing for non-Native American burials will also be done at the St. Columba cemetery. Historic property investigations are continuing and will include determinations of eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places for any potentially significant structures in the area of potential effect of the alternatives.
- ❑ A noise analysis will be done after the range of build alternatives has been settled on.

- The results of the spring traffic study are being analyzed and will be used to validate assumptions regarding local versus through traffic split; the information will be included in the Draft EIS Purpose and Need section.

Discussion on Agenda Item 4

Don Weiland expressed skepticism about the license plate traffic survey; he noted that one camera at Hubertus Road kept tipping over during the survey. He also provided a list of questions and comments to the study team on the Draft EIS Purpose and Need section. Brad responded that the study team is in the process of evaluating the survey data and that such problems will be accounted for in finalizing the data.

Steve Holzhauer asked why existing traffic is from 1997 and 1998. Brad explained that existing traffic is based on the Wis DOT count data; counts are not done every year.

Jeff Gonyo restated his standing opposition to any 4-lane improvements in the corridor and his opinion that traffic dispersal on a 2-lane road system would suffice. He disagrees with characterizing the existing highway as having national and regional importance, disputes traffic data, and notes that the project's north terminus should be WIS 60 (including the Ackerville bridge project); the terminus as presented (0.5 mile north of County E) ends near a private driveway. Jeff handed out the following materials that he requested be part of the record for PAC #3:

- March 23, 2000 letter to WisDOT from Citizens for a Better Environment and Highway J Citizens Group requesting that the Ackerville bridge project be included in the WIS 164 Draft EIS.
- June 8, 2000 newspaper article on Waukesha County Traffic Safety Commission meeting indicating traffic counts at four different locations on WIS 164 ranged from 2,761 to 3,412.
- February 7, 2000 excerpt from newsletter on Ackerville bridge project indicating that the regional transportation plan calls for capacity expansion between I-94 and WIS 60.

Ken Pesch noted that the traffic in the news article was only for one direction and that those numbers need to be doubled to reflect the total traffic which would then be consistent with WisDOT's historic traffic count data.

5. Study Team Review of Preliminary Alternatives and Recommendations for

Retaining or Dropping from Further Consideration

The presentation on alternatives was led by Brad using a slide show; the following introductory information was provided:

Design Speed and Proposed Typical Section

- ❑ 50 mph design speed south of Plainview (45-50 mph posted speed)
- ❑ 60 mph design speed north of Plainview (55 mph posted speed with exceptions)
- ❑ Urban typical section south of Plainview (120 feet of right-of-way)
- ❑ Hybrid typical section north of Plainview, urban in select locations (140-160 feet of right-of-way)

Alternatives Labeling Scheme

- ❑ Alternative A—widen west
- ❑ Alternative B—widen east
- ❑ Alternative C—widen “down the middle”
- ❑ Alternatives F, G, H, I—off alignment
- ❑ Alternative X—2-lane improvements

Don Weiland noted the information on design speeds is new and asked when this decision was made. Brad responded that the study team in consultation with WisDOT recently determined that a 50 mph design speed south of Plainview will suffice and is compatible with future land use trends. This also allows using a narrower roadway cross section.

The alternatives presentation continued by project section. Key points regarding the study team’s recommendations for alternatives in each section are summarized as follows:

Section 1—I-94 to Capitol Drive

The alternatives include 1A—widen west, 1B—widen east, 1C—widen down the middle, 1F—follow old 164 to Capitol Drive, and 1X—2-lane improvements.

A general comparison between on-alignment and off-alignment alternatives was made:

- ❑ 1A, 1B, and 1C—consistent with Regional Plan, address current and projected traffic
- ❑ 1F—not consistent with Regional Plan, does not address current and projected traffic
- ❑ 1X—not consistent with Regional Plan, does not address current and project traffic

A general comparison between the on-alignment alternatives was made:

- ❑ 1A—4 relocations, cost of \$7.1 million, access issues, would allow use of existing lanes during construction
- ❑ 1B—2 relocations, cost of \$6.3 million, access issues, would allow use of existing lanes during construction
- ❑ 1C—4 relocations, cost of \$7.7 million, would shift to one side to use existing bridge, traffic control during construction more difficult than with 1A or 1B

The study team's recommendations were:

- ❑ Retain 1B, 1C, or combination
- ❑ Drop 1A, 1F, and 1X

Discussion on Section 1 Recommendations

Jeff Weigel noted the City of Pewaukee has been following the Regional Plan since 1982 and is proceeding with local planning based on widening the existing highway.

Jeff Gonyo asked why the I-94 to Capitol Drive portion is still under county jurisdiction and stated it would have made more sense to transfer the entire corridor at the same time. Roger Cupps responded that this portion would be transferred to WisDOT jurisdiction following reconstruction as part of the jurisdictional transfer agreement between WisDOT and Waukesha County. Jeff asked whether it would be constructed to county or state standards. Roger responded that it would be reconstructed to state standards.

Steve Holzhauer asked why Alternative 1F is being dropped if it would not cost anything to follow existing 164. Roger Cupps responded that although using existing 164 would not have a cost as such, CTH J would still need to be widened; therefore the cost would be the same as for the other on-alignment alternatives.

Don Weiland noted he is still not satisfied that his suggested specific alternative using the CTH V and CTH Y is not being considered. Brian Bliesner responded that the study team has not ignored Don's alternative; rather, other representative off-alignment alternatives were used for traffic diversion modeling. These are not substantially different from Don's suggested alternative. Don stated his alternative is different in that it requires only a short segment of new roadway to make a connection between CTH V and CTH Y.

Jeff Gonyo reiterated his opposition to a 4-lane alternative and stated the only alternative he will support for the entire corridor is an improved 2-lane road. He referenced 2 publications and requested that these be entered into the record for PAC #3:

- ❑ June 16, 2000 letter from Walter Kulash with attached article by Mark Hansen titled “Do Highways Generate Traffic?” One of the key points in the Hansen article is that expanding a roadway to accommodate forecast traffic will lead to having to expand it even more in the future. Controlling road size at the outset will control future congestion.
- ❑ Article titled “Road Diets—Fixing the Big Roads”. Jeff’s reading of this article is that 4-lane roads are not as efficient as 2-lane roads.

Kevin Yanny noted Waukesha County would like to see more engineering detail on the alternatives before taking a position.

Section 2—Capitol Drive to Pewaukee Road

The alternatives include 2A—widen west (with common section), 2B—widen east (with common section), 2F—Capitol Drive/WIS 16/Lindsay Road, 2G/2H—Capitol Drive/Cecelia Street, 2I—Old 164/Lisbon Road, and 2X—2-lane improvements.

A general comparison between on-alignment and off-alignment alternatives was made:

- ❑ 2A and 2B—consistent with Regional Plan, address current and projected traffic, one potentially historic site, 2-4 relocations
- ❑ 2F and 2G/2H—not consistent with Regional plan, do not address current and projected traffic, 1 potentially historic site, 3-8 relocations
- ❑ 2I—not consistent with Regional Plan, does not address current and projected traffic, 3 potentially historic sites, 11 relocations
- ❑ 2X—not consistent with Regional Plan, does not address current and projected traffic, 1 potentially historic site, 1 relocation

A general comparison between the on-alignment alternatives was made:

- ❑ 2A—2 relocations, 1 potentially historic site, cost of \$9.4 million
- ❑ 2B—4 relocations, no potentially historic sites, cost of \$10.3 million

The study team’s recommendations were:

- ❑ Retain 2A, 2B, or combination
- ❑ Drop 2F, 2G/2H, 2I, and 2X

Discussion on Section 2 Recommendations

Jeff Musche asked about the cost for the off-alignment alternatives. Brad responded that the cost is included in the impact summary table in the meeting handout. The cost ranges from \$8.7 to \$12.6 million (not including cost to reconstruct the existing highway as well).

Jeff Gonyo reiterated his opposition to any 4-lane alternative and stated he would only support a 2-lane improvement alternative.

Jeff Weigel stated the City of Pewaukee supports widening the existing roadway consistent with the Regional Plan.

Jerry Schmitz asked whether platting for the subdivisions and condos next to the existing highway was done in view of the future roadway widening. Jeff Weigel responded that these are located in the village of Pewaukee, not the City. Ken Yunker noted that the long-standing plans for roadway widening have resulted in acquisition/dedication of right-of-way over the years such that 100 feet is in place throughout Waukesha County.

Don Weiland asked why the cost is so high for Alternative 2I. Brad responded that it is because of the number of relocations involved.

Section 3—Pewaukee Road to Jay Lane

The alternatives include 3A—widen west (with common segment), 3B—widen east (with common segment), 3F—middle west, off-alignment, 3G—near west, off-alignment, and 3X—2-lane improvements.

A general comparison between on-alignment and off-alignment alternatives was made:

- ❑ 3A and 3B—address projected traffic, total new right-of-way 8-11 acres, 2-4 relocations, additional access necessary near RR bridge
- ❑ 3F and 3G—address projected traffic, total new right-of-way 39-45 acres, 2 relocations, existing 164 becomes local road
- ❑ 3X—does not address projected traffic, total new right-of-way 0.4 acre, 2 relocations, additional access necessary near RR bridge

The study team's recommendations were:

- ❑ Retain 3A, 3B, or combination
- ❑ Drop 3F, 3G, and 3X

Discussion on Section 3 Recommendations

Brad noted there would be a RR grade separation with either on or off-alignment alternatives. Roger Cupps added that the Bugline Trail would also need to be grade separated.

Curt Bolton noted stormwater storage would also be an issue and asked what would happen to

existing 164 with an off-alignment alternative. Brad responded that existing 164 would be transferred to local jurisdiction.

Jeff Musche asked what the reasons were for dropping Alternatives 3F and 3G. Brad responded that the recommendation included a combination of factors such as amount of right-of-way required, agricultural severances, and visibility for existing businesses on 164, and other factors.

Don Weiland asked what the study team's expectation was at the conclusion of the PAC meeting. Brad responded that his expectation is for PAC members to know which alternatives are being recommended for elimination and which are recommended for more detailed study. Brian Bliesner noted the study team does not need final opinions from PAC members today; additional input can be received after the PAC meeting.

Jeff Gonyo reiterated his opposition to all but the 2-lane improvement alternative. The alternatives being considered are about moving traffic; there is no consideration for public and human concerns by those who live along the corridor. Jeff again noted his contention that the highway does not have "national" importance and should not be characterized as a facility with national, regional, and local importance.

Jeff Retzlaff noted that only a few impact categories are being cited in the discussion and asked whether impact criteria would be weighted in any way in the decision process. Brad responded that a larger list of impact categories is presented on the impact summary table in the PAC handout; only a few key impact categories are being presented during the discussion to illustrate differences between the alternatives and for brevity. Weights and rankings are not assigned to the impact categories.

Roger Cupps noted that people he spoke with at the last public information meeting did not support off-alignment alternatives in this section. Brad responded that the main reason the off-alignment alternatives were developed in this section was recognition that it would be difficult to go up and over the RR while still providing access to adjacent properties. Dan Dupies noted the study team did hear from Brighton Estates representatives who preferred an on-alignment alternative.

Jerry Schmitz noted the town would need to address the issue of access if the Hillside Road connection to 164 is abandoned. Brad responded that a decision has not yet been made regarding the Hillside Road connection. Brian noted that if a change needs to be made to the existing intersection, alternative access would be provided.

Joe Greco noted there are substantial environmental concerns with the off-alignment alternatives and reiterated the Village of Menomonee Falls position that improvements should be oriented to the existing highway.

Section 4—Jay Lane to Bark River

The alternatives include 4A—widen west, 4B—widen east, and 4X—2-lane improvement.

A general comparison between the alternatives was made:

- ❑ 4A and 4B—address projected traffic, total new right-of-way 5-6 acres, 3-5 relocations
- ❑ 4X—does not address projected traffic, total new right-of-way 0.5 acre, no relocations

The study team's recommendations were:

- ❑ Retain 4A
- ❑ Drop 4B and 4X

Discussion on Section 4 Recommendations

Jeff Gonyo reiterated his criticism that the 2-lane alternative is not being considered as a viable alternative throughout the corridor. Don Weiland added that improvements on existing 164 would actually increase traffic. Brad responded that traffic growth in the region and on 164 has been about 2% per year. Actual traffic growth has been higher (about 5.7% growth per year) based on automatic traffic counts taken since the late 1970's (20 years prior to jurisdictional transfer). This growth has occurred due to increased development, not because of any plans for jurisdictional transfer or any plans to widen the existing highway. The traffic projections being used are based on the lower 2% growth assumed in the Regional Plan, thus they are conservative compared to the actual growth that is occurring.

Jeff Gonyo stated his opinion that the traffic projections are flawed because SEWRPC modeling did not include a scenario with Power Corridor in place and a 45 mph speed limit on existing 164. He also noted the modeling did not consider improvements to WIS 83 (previously considered bypass that was abandoned due to public opposition).

Ken Yunker noted that SEWRPC did model a scenario assuming the Power Corridor in place, a 2-lane facility on existing 164 and 45 mph speed limit. This was discussed at the last PAC meeting and is included in SEWRPC's modeling memo. A scenario with 4 lanes on 164, present speed limits, and the Power Corridor in place was also modeled. Ken also noted its not just the Regional Plan's recommendations we are dealing with; but the Waukesha and Washington County Jurisdictional Highway System Plans well. Local officials have been involved in the preparation of these plans and their recommended improvements. With respect to traffic, the projections show that if the Power corridor were built and 164 kept at 2 lanes and posted at 45 mph, traffic would still be over the 13,000 threshold through much of Waukesha County. One needs to look at the actual numbers for the various scenarios and not apply an average 33% reduction to all situations. Regarding Jeff's contention (per Walter Kulash information) that a 2-lane is more efficient, Ken noted that the nominal design capacity for a 2-lane highway is 13,000 and 25,000 for a 4-lane highway. Going from a 2 to 4 lane highway adds 12,000 to capacity, not 13,000. Thus, while we can say a 2-lane highway might be more efficient, it doesn't necessarily follow that a 2-lane highway can handle traffic better than a 4-lane highway. The premise behind the Kulash theory is having a dense grid of 2-lane highways located ¼ to ½ mile apart.

Jeff Gonyo stated that traffic presently travels west to utilize the 164 corridor. If old 164 were

extended to the north per the original SEWRPC recommendation in the mid 1970's, traffic would use that corridor to travel north rather than the present 164 corridor. He again referenced the Road Diets article where multi-lane roads were pared down to 2-lane roads.

Ken Yunker noted that what was proposed in the mid 1970's was a metropolitan beltway around the Milwaukee area from I-94 near Oak Creek, through Franklin and Muskego; the interchange with I-94 would have been about where the Brookfield Corporate Lakes office park is located today; it would have proceeded north roughly along the Power Corridor and then would have connected to USH 41 and even envisioned a connection to I-43. It was dropped primarily because the core freeway system that is in place today was built instead and local support for any additional freeway components waned during that time. Brad Heimlich noted there would also have been substantial environmental impacts associated with the belt freeway as originally envisioned.

Brian Bliesner noted that the belt freeway plan from the mid 1970's did not include extending existing 164. Ken Yunker agreed.

Section 5—Bark River to Monches Road

The alternatives include 5A—widen west (with common section), 5B—widen east (with common section), 5F—long west, off-alignment, 5G—short west, off-alignment, and 5X—2-lane improvements.

A general comparison between the alternatives was made:

- ❑ 5A and 5B—address projected traffic, total new right-of-way 8 acres, farmland 1-4 acres, close north end of Shady Lane, 3-12 relocations
- ❑ 5F and 5G—address projected traffic, total new right-of-way 23-26 acres, farmland 17-30 acres, avoids cemetery, 2-8 relocations
- ❑ 5X—does not address projected traffic, total new right-of-way 2 acres, farmland 1 acre, close north end of Shady Lane, 2 relocations

The study team's recommendations were:

- ❑ Retain 5A, 5B, or combination
- ❑ Drop 5F, 5G, and 5X
- ❑ Await cemetery study (5F and 5G)
- ❑ 5X viable with improvements until/if 13,000 threshold reached

Discussion on Section 5 Recommendations

Jeff Retzlaff asked for clarification regarding the study team's intention for Alternative 5X. Brad responded that the traffic drops off from a point in Section 5 to the north and that a 4-lane

improvement would not be constructed until or if the 13,000 threshold materializes. Mary O'Brien stated Alternative 5X is not being considered a viable stand-alone alternative. It is being characterized as an interim improvement until a 4-lane facility is warranted. Brad also noted that the Ackerville bridge project would be constructed as an initial 2-lane facility, including the bridge itself, until or if traffic volumes warrant the additional 2 lanes.

Jeff Gonyo noted there is a nature preserve in Section 5 that is not included in the present impact summary table; this needs to be considered in the impact evaluation. He also reiterated his concern about characterizing the 164 corridor as having national importance. Mary O'Brien responded that the national importance part of the corridor description is based on its designation as a component of the National Highway System.

Jeff Gonyo reiterated his objection to not including the Ackerville bridge project as part of the present EIS, and questioned the legality of not including it. Jay Waldschmidt responded that the Ackerville bridge project has been appropriately documented as a separate action and that FHWA and WisDOT have addressed issues regarding any project segmentation.

Jeff Retzlaff asked what type of information from the pending cemetery study would cause Alternatives F and G to be reconsidered. Dan Dupies responded that the first step would be to do a less invasive radar penetration test to find out the potential for any burials. This will be followed by shallow scrapes if needed to confirm any potential burials. If burials were discovered, the alignment would need to avoid these.

Chuck Kugel asked how PAC members would find out about the results of the cemetery study. Brad responded that the results would be included in the Draft EIS, but that interested PAC members can call to check on the results that are expected by the end of summer.

Jerry Schmitz stated the Town of Lisbon would like to see Alternatives F and G carried forward as viable alternatives.

Ann Remmel asked whether the study team has gotten a reading from the Town of Richfield on their preference regarding Alternatives F and G.

Jeff Retzlaff stated the Town of Richfield would also like to see Alternatives F and G carried forward.

Jeff Gonyo stated that SEWRPC's traffic modeling showed that there would be a 33% traffic diversion from 164 with the off-alignment alternative; therefore volumes near the Waukesha/Washington County line and in Washington County would be reduced to the point where a 2-lane highway would suffice. Brad and Brian Bliesner responded that there will not be 33% diversion for the entire corridor; diversion decreases as one moves north to a minimum of 10% at the far north end of the corridor. Brian suggested that a meeting be held with Jeff and others to review the SEWRPC modeling results in detail so the percent diversion issue can be cleared up.

Section 6—Monches Road to Oconomowoc River

The alternatives include 6A—widen west, 6B, widen east, 6C—widen down the middle, and 6X—2-lane improvements. Brad noted 6C was added following the last public information meeting.

A general comparison between the alternatives was made:

- ❑ 6A and 6B—total right-of-way 19 acres, farmland 6-10 acres, constructed when/if 13,000 threshold is met, 12-14 relocations
- ❑ 6C—total right-of-way 21 acres, farmland 9 acres, constructed when/if 13,000 threshold is met, 6 relocations
- ❑ 6X—total right-of-way 7 acres, farmland 3 acres, possible interim improvement until/if 13,000 threshold is met, 5 relocations

The study team's recommendations were:

- ❑ Retain 6A, 6C, or combination
- ❑ Drop 6B and 6X (as stand-alone alternative)

Discussion on Section 6 Recommendations

Jeff Gonyo criticized the fact that the upcoming resurfacing project will not include any of the safety improvements that have been requested by area citizens (turn lanes, signals, cutting hills). These types of improvements would suffice for a long time.

Key Yunker stated that citizens and other interests along the southern portion of the 164 corridor have been requesting improvements since the late 1980's and early 1990's; it is not a fair characterization to say there is no support for the improvements. Jeff Gonyo responded that he is not opposed to some level of improvement, but it should be reconstructing the existing 2-lane highway.

Jeff Retzlaff asked by Alternative 6B is recommended for elimination. Jeff Bauer responded that while there isn't a clear difference between 6B and 6A, the choice was based on the study team's opinion that 6B does not minimize overall impacts to existing development and other resources as well as 6A.

Don Weiland stated it doesn't make sense to drop Alternative 6X given its substantially lower cost compared to other alternatives. He also reiterated his position that an alternative following CTH Y should also be considered. Brad responded that 6X as a stand-alone alternative does not meet project purpose and need because it is not consistent with the Regional Plan.

Ken Yunker noted that CTH Y is also included in the Regional Plan as a future 4-lane highway and that it would not relieve traffic from the 164 corridor. He also reiterated that the 4-lane alternative on 164 is being recommended as the long-term solution (20 years); WisDOT would

preserve right-of-way for a future 4-lane road so it can be constructed when traffic volumes reach the 13,000 threshold; the 2-lane alternative would be an interim improvement until traffic volumes reach the point where additional capacity is needed; traffic is and will continue to be the result of development; SEWRPC will continue to work with local governments to review and evaluate development growth trends over time; the resurfacing project is to address immediate needs relative to pavement condition and may need to be done again in a 10 to 15 year period.

Don Weiland stated there is not as much controversy in Waukesha County because fewer people live along the existing highway; the 1,000+ signature petition collected from residents in the north part of the corridor indicates clear opposition to any 4-lane improvement in Washington County. He also reiterated his concern that trucking businesses were contacted for input to the Draft EIS purpose and need section but the petition is not mentioned. Brad and Mary responded that citizen views on the alternatives would be fully disclosed in the Draft EIS in subsequent sections. The trucking business survey was done in response to PAC member inquiries about the extent of local truck use along the corridor. Don continued to disagree with the study team's approach to where information should be included in the Draft EIS.

Jeff Retzlaff requested that Alternative 6B be retained as a viable alternative.

Jeff Gonyo reiterated his opposition to all alternatives except a 2-lane improvement. He also stated there are gaps in information being presented and referred to a June 11 letter he sent to WisDOT under the open records law requesting copies of all file documents, etc. that have been generated to date for the study.

Chuck Kugel asked why a wider cross section is needed on the north end when traffic volumes are lower. Brad responded that the cross section is wider because the design speed (60 mph) and posted speed (55 mph) is higher on the north end where there is less development, fewer access points, and fewer traffic generators. Chuck stated he prefers a narrower cross section throughout (120' versus 160').

Brian Bliesner noted the possibility of lowering the speed limit in the future is not precluded if conditions change (development density, etc.).

Don Weiland thinks the speed limit should be lowered at this point in the study; he noted that the Washington County Safety Committee recommends lowering the speed limit. Roger Cupps responded that WisDOT has not received any official notification from the County requesting a lower speed limit. Don asked whom to send such a notification to if it is obtained from the County. Roger responded that it should be sent to the District Director, Les Fafard.

Jeff Gonyo noted Ed Friede (WisDOT) indicated the 45 mph speed limit at STH 167 is too low and that it should be raised back up to 55 mph; Jeff reiterated his position that the speed limit on the entire corridor should be no more than 45 mph.

Ken Pesch stated he did not believe Ed Friede stated the speed limit should be raised to 55, rather, he believes Ed indicated the reduction in accidents at STH 167 are likely due to the recent reconstruction rather than reducing the speed limit.

Section 7—Oconomowoc River to Pioneer Road

The alternatives include 7A—widen west (with common segment), 7B—widen east (with common segment), 7F—far west off-alignment, 7G—near west off-alignment, and 7X—2-lane improvements.

A general comparison between the alternatives was made:

- ❑ 7A and 7B—3-5 relocations, total new right-of-way 8 acres, farmland 3-4 acres, constructed when/if 13,000 threshold met
- ❑ 7F and 7G—0-3 relocations, total new right-of-way 16-28 acres, farmland 6-20 acres, constructed when/if 13,000 threshold met
- ❑ 7X—5 relocations, total new right-of-way 4 acres, farmland 2 acres, possible interim improvement until/if 13,000 threshold met

The study team's recommendations were:

- ❑ Retain 7A, 7B, or combination
- ❑ Drop 7F, 7G, and 7X (as stand alone alternative)
- ❑ Await archaeological study (7F and 7G)

Discussion on Section 7 Recommendations

Jeff Gonyo noted that archaeological investigations should be done for area adjacent to the river as well as at the Graystone Subdivision; area residents have reported finding artifacts over the years. Brad responded that the archaeological investigation covers the entire 164 corridor. Jeff also stated lowering the speed limit and traffic lights at Pleasant Hill needs to be done now.

Jeff Retzlaff stated Alternatives 7F and 7G should be retained as viable alternatives.

Section 8—Pioneer Road to CTH E

The alternatives include 8A—widen west, 8B—widen east, and 8X—2-lane improvements.

A general comparison between the alternatives was made:

- ❑ 8A and 8B—3-7 relocations, total new right-of-way 12-15 acres, constructed when/if 13,000 threshold met

- ❑ 8X—no relocations, total new right-of-way 6 acres, possible interim improvement until/if 13,000 threshold met

The study team's recommendations were:

- ❑ Retain 8A
- ❑ Drop 8B and 8X (as stand alone alternative)

Discussion on Section 8 Recommendations

Don Weiland stated he wants the 2-lane improvement alternative to be considered as a viable alternative for the entire project corridor.

Jeff Gonyo reiterated his contention that the Ackerville bridge project should be included in the present EIS and that the group he represents will vigorously challenge the EIS if this is not done.

Power Corridor Alternative

The Power Corridor Alternative would follow old 164 north to Lisbon Road, Lisbon Road east to the powerline easement, powerline easement north to CTH Y, then CTH Y northeast to USH 41/45.

A general comparison between on-alignment alternatives and the Power Corridor Alternative was made:

- ❑ On-alignment alternatives—consistent with Regional Plan, address current/projected traffic, sections would be constructed when/if the 13,000 threshold is met
- ❑ Power Corridor—not consistent with Regional Plan, does not address current/projected traffic, would divert 5 to 20% traffic from 164 (postponing but not eliminating the need for long-term capacity expansion).

A general impact comparison between the on-alignment alternatives and the Power Corridor Alternative was made; the impacts for the Power Corridor Alternative include 2-lane improvements on existing 164:

- ❑ On-alignment alternatives—total new right-of-way 88-95 acres, wetland 11-13 acres, 40-45 relocations, cost of \$63-\$65 million, 15 stream crossings
- ❑ Power Corridor Alternative—total new right-of-way 180-198 acres, farmland 55-72 acres, wetland 55 acres, 26-31 relocations, cost of \$55-\$59 million, 31 stream crossings including 2,800 foot channel relocation of Fox River.

The study team's recommendations were:

- ❑ Retain on-alignment alternatives
- ❑ Drop Power Corridor alternative

Discussion on Power Corridor Recommendations

Jeff Gonyo stated the main advantage of the Power Corridor is that it provides a direct route for traffic to USH 41 as opposed to the on-alignment alternatives that “dead end” at Slinger; it solves problems on both ends of the corridor. He also continued to contend that the Power Corridor would divert a substantial amount of traffic from the existing 164 corridor, and stated it would preclude having to reconstruct CTH Y to 4 lanes, thus eliminating impacts to that heavily residential highway. Jeff also noted he suggests that WIS 83 be improved to handle traffic west of the 164 corridor; this combined with the Power Corridor to handle traffic east of the 164 corridor and 2-lane improvements on existing 164 would be the best solution.

Joe Greco supports dropping the Power Corridor noting that growth is occurring west of that corridor that it would not serve, and the extent of wetland impacts which his engineering department calculated to be greater than the study team’s preliminary acreage.

Jerry Schmitz noted that trucks are not allowed on CTH VV, therefore access should not be allowed to the Power Corridor from CTH VV.

Ken Pesch stated he supports eliminating the Power Corridor as a viable alternative.

Steve Bruskiewicz noted the Village of Germantown has passed a resolution supporting elimination of the Power Corridor as a viable alternative.

Don Weiland contends that the Power Corridor would relieve about 2,000 cars per day from 164 because that volume is being contributed to 164 from CTH V and/or CTH Y.

Ken Yunker noted that even if the Power Corridor were built and CTH Y were widened to 4 lanes, there would still be a need for additional capacity in Waukesha County south of Plainview Road.

Jerry Schmitz stated that the Town of Lisbon is concerned about a traffic volume of 10,000 on 164.

Roger Cupps noted that 164 would likely be transferred to County jurisdiction with the Power Corridor alternative.

Ken Yunker noted that all local roads in the region are experiencing substantial traffic growth that is not coming from one particular location but is a but is a reflection of development growth and land use changes.

Don Weiland stated the study team is looking at traffic as a “black and white” issue between

Capitol Drive and Plainview and wants to see minor improvements made to the existing highway as part of the resurfacing project such as wider shoulders and cutting hills (particularly at Hubertus Road).

Brian Wilson (WisDOT engineer for resurfacing project) explained that funding for that project does not include real estate acquisition which would be required to make the types of improvements Don is suggesting; the resurfacing project is within existing highway right-of-way.

Ann Rummel asked for clarification regarding the cost for the Power Corridor; does it include 4-lane improvements? Brad responded that it does include a 4-lane roadway on the Power Corridor alignment.

Ann Rummel expressed concern that 4-lane improvements to 164 will attract more traffic along with associated impacts; citizens along the corridor don't mind taking their share of impacts, but other roads should be improved to disperse the traffic.

Jeff Gonyo pointed out that the project's web site needs to be updated. He did not see the notes from the second public information meeting. He also reiterated his public records request to WisDOT. *Note: Subsequent to the PAC meeting, it was verified that the website has the notes from the second public meeting but these were inadvertently identified as notes from the first meeting. This error has been corrected.*